

**Question L-81:** Does the scope of the approved BIO include the following activities?

- a. HEPA Filter change out
- b. Decontamination of Equipment
- c. Re-packaging of wastes
- d. Processing of pyrophoric wastes by deactivation through chemical treatment
- e. Loading of shipping casks
- f. Disassembly of non –essential non-safety related equipment

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.3 Fuel Specimen and Material Research Hotcell Facility Background. Section 4.3 states that “The Nuclear Safety Analysis Report for the FSMHF was out of date and a Basis for Interim Operation and Technical Safety Requirements has been approved. These documents will have to be revised as appropriate to reflect the planned decontamination and demolition of the facility.” Based on this statement, offerors can assume that the BIO currently describes routine operational and maintenance activities such as HEPA filter replacement, waste packaging, repackaging and loading of shipping casks. The BIO does not describe equipment or facility decontamination, disassembly of equipment (including non-essential, non-safety equipment), waste treatment (including pyrophoric waste treatment), or other D&D activities.

**Question L-82:** How many RH 72B casks will be available to the project?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.4 Task Scope. Section 4.4 includes “all activities required to support disposal of transuranic wastes to the DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility.” If offerors proposes to ship TRU waste in RH72B Containers to the WIPP facility, offerors can assume that there will be a maximum of two containers available per week will be provided as government furnished property at no cost.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-83:** Who will pay for the services of the CCP to certify the TRU waste shipments?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.4 Task Scope. Section 4.4 includes “all activities required to support disposal of transuranic wastes to the DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility.” Offerors should assume that the Central Characterization Project (CCP) certification of TRU waste shipments and associated costs are covered under a separate contract between the DOE and the certification contractor and will be provided as government furnished services.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-84:** Will “deactivation” operations of the hot cell require the issuance of a ROD under NEPA?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 3.0 General Background. Section 3.0 states that “A Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) is being negotiated among DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Illinois. The site has completed its initial investigations of soil and groundwater in the area pending finalization of the FFA.” Offerors should assume that approval of the FFA agreement and revised Basis of Interim Operations (BIO) will authorize equipment and facility decontamination, disassembly of safety or non-safety related equipment, waste treatment and other D&D activities prior to approval of the ROD. Offerors should also assume that building demolition can not begin until after the ROD is approved and that the FFA Agreement will be completed prior to approval of the BIO.

**Question L-85:** Attachment L-4, Sample Task: What is the height of building at shortest and tallest points of the structure, not including roof mounted equipment?

**Answer:** Reference Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, As Built Drawing 1. As Built Drawing 1 shows the height of the building at its tallest point to be 28 ft. 8 in., excluding the cooling tower which is an additional 12 ft. 9 in. in height.

**Question L-86:**

Reference: Pg. 10 of Attachment L-4 states:

Task scope includes the following:

...Characterization of groundwater plumes, development of groundwater strategies, and design(s) of proposed groundwater remedy(ies);

Reference: Section 5.0 of Attachment L-4 indicates the deliverables

Deliverable 12: Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study; Source: CERCLA Regulations and Requirements

Deliverable 13: Remedial Action Plan; Source: CERCLA Regulations and Requirements

Reference: Section L.31 (pg 83 of 98) states:

- Approach for Soil and Groundwater and DD&R  
This includes groundwater and soil characterization and modeling; proposed approach to adherence to enforceable schedules; identification, and design, including design of proposed groundwater remedy(ies)...

Does DOE expect a conceptual design of the recommended groundwater remedies to be included in the Sample Problem response?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Section 4.4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, Section 5.0, and Section L.31 (1) Criterion 1 – Technical and Management Approach (Sample Task). Offerors should provide a design which is a pictorial representation, such as a drawing, of the proposed groundwater remedy(ies) at a level of detail sufficient to depict the planned approach(es) to be taken, the technologies to be deployed, and the approximate remedy location(s). Offerors do not need to provide detailed engineering designs.

**Question L-87:** Reference: RFP Attachment L-6 and L-7. Question: To maintain compliance with the 10 point font requirement for cost data (i.e Attachment L-6 and L-7), we will need to print the cost sheets at 11x17 so there is no font scaling. Will the DOE allow Offerors to submit Volume III in an 11x17 binder, eliminating folded pages and providing reviewers with an easier read?

**Answer:** Reference Attachment L-6 and L-7 and L.29(h) Page Description. Offerors may submit Volume III in an 11x17 binder in order to maintain compliance with the 10 point requirement for cost data (i.e., Attachment L-6 and L-7).

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-88:** Reference L.29 para (h). Is it acceptable to use a font smaller than 10 point for the detailed schedule 5 sheets to be provided in Cost Volume?

**Answer:** See answer to Question L-22.

DE-SOL-0000638  
Questions & Answers L-81 through L-123  
Posted 11/19/2009

**Question L-89:** The SF 33 has two continuation sheets (Optional Form 336) as provided in the RFP. Does the Government desire for bidders to include these 2 pages of optional pages with the executed SF 33 form as required in Volume I, (RFP paragraph L.30 (b) (1)).

**Answer:** Reference Section A, Standard Form (SF) 33 and Optional Form (OF) 336 and Section L.30 (1). Offerors shall return a fully executed copy of the SF33 in Volume I of their proposal. The two continuation sheets (OF 336) need not be included in Volume I.

**Question L-90:** Section L.32, paragraph (7), third sentence, page 88 of 98: This section states that "For amounts based on actual and verifiable data, evidence shall be included in the proposal." Question: What type of specific evidence is required? Is this the proper place to submit estimate backup data?

**Answer:** Reference Section L.32 (7). For information other than indirect rates, specific types of evidence includes, but is not limited to, a description of what the estimate is based on, for example: vendor quotations, engineering judgment, market research, etc., if any. Actual documentation is not required. For indirect rates only, evidence of actual costs recorded within the offerors' accounting system used as the basis of or in support of indirect rates proposed or from which out-year rate projections are made; copies of certified incurred cost rate submissions; memorandum evidence in support of approved provisional indirect rates, etc. should be included. Regarding direct labor rates for specific labor categories, the Offeror should ensure that the proposed rates at a minimum meet the rates for those categories stated in the Wage Determination.

**Question L-91:** Reference: RFP page 88 Section L.32(7) states "For amounts based on actual and verifiable data, evidence shall be included in the proposal." RFP Section L.32(11) states "The offeror shall provide the location (address and telephone number and point of contact) of where documentation supporting Volume III is located." Question: should the offeror include ALL estimate back-up in the proposal, or will the location of the estimate back-up suffice?

**Answer:** Reference Section L.32 (7) and (11). It is not clear what is meant by "ALL" estimate back-up. However, offerors need to provide the data and information required as set forth in Section L.32. Also, see answer to Question 90. The location of where documentation supporting Volume III is located can not be substituted for the other information required in L.32.

**Question L-92:** Section L.32, Section (8)a., 3rd paragraph, 3rd sentence, page 89 of 98 and Attachment L-6, Instructions for Required Cost Templates, Schedule 1, 2nd Paragraph, last two sentences: Section L(8)a states: "For purposes of the sample task, fee shall not be proposed separately for the proposed subcontractors." However, the instructions on Schedule 1 read: "If fee is proposed separately for the subcontractor, identify on the subcontractor sheet. If shared fee, report on the prime offeror sheet only." Please clarify. Can fee be proposed for subcontractors?

**Answer:** Reference Sections L.32 (4)c, L.32 (4)d, L.32(8), and Clause B.2 Fee Ceiling. For purposes of the sample task, fee shall not be proposed separately for any major or critical subcontractors, any other subcontractors, and if a joint venture or newly formed entity, any member. All of the foregoing fees, including subcontractor fees are to be included in the Base Fee and Award Fee amount as referenced in Section L.32(4)c and d. Offerors shall propose a base plus award fee that equals the fee ceiling proposed in Clause B.2 Fee Ceiling. Although the sample task is a cost plus award fee task order, it is not the intent to establish a fee pool for each of the cost plus fixed fee task orders that may be issued under this contract. Agreement as to the distribution of fee is established between offerors and any major or critical subcontractors, any other subcontractors, and if a joint venture or newly formed entity, any member. Attachment L-6, Table of Contents Worksheet, Instructions for Required Cost Templates (Schedule 1) will be revised.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-93:** Section L, Attachment L-6, Schedule 5, 1st Red Text Box, 2nd paragraph, last sentence: This sentence directs major or critical subcontractors etc., to use “fully burdened direct labor rates” yet the first column on the spreadsheet (under Joint Venture/LLC Member/Subcontractor) shows rows for Fringe Benefits and Direct Labor Overhead. If fully burdened direct labor rates are to be used, fringe benefits and direct labor overhead should not apply. Please confirm.

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-6, Schedule 5, 1st Red Text Box, 2nd paragraph, last sentence. The instructions indicate offerors *may* (emphasis added) provide the requested information for major or critical subcontractors or, if a joint venture or newly formed entity, all members, or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance, on its Schedule 5 cost worksheets using fully burdened direct labor rates and fully burdened non-labor unit rates that were used to develop the proposed costs for the respective entities.” If offerors elect to provide the requested information for major or critical subcontractors or, if a joint venture or newly formed entity, all members, or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance, on its Schedule 5 cost worksheets using fully burdened direct labor rates and fully burdened non-labor unit rates, then the cost elements for Fringe Benefits, Direct Labor Overhead, and any other indirect cost elements (included in the first column of the spreadsheet under Joint Venture/LLC Member/Subcontractor) for any of these entities should not apply.

**Question L-94:** Reference L.32 Cost Volume. We are currently in the process of establishing new forward pricing direct and indirect rates with DCMA. These auditable rates will be effective on or about the time of the proposal submission and will remain in effect for the sample problem timeline. We recognize that DOE has selected Oct 1 2009 as the start date for the sample problem. Since we had auditable rates in effect for the October through November timeframe that will no longer be effective at the time of **proposal submission**, we assume it will be acceptable to use the new forward pricing rates that will then be in effect at the time of proposal submission for the pricing of the entire sample problem. Do you concur with this approach?

**Answer:** Reference L.32. Initially it is not clear whether or not the forward pricing direct and indirect rates will have been agreed to in a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) with DCMA, whether the rates will be recommended rates in a Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation (FPRR) by DCMA, or whether the FPRA or FPRR will be finalized by time of proposal submission. However, offerors should propose the rates that reflect the costs that will be incurred in performance of the sample task. If the offerors' rates in December 2009 to the end of the period of performance of the sample task are used to price the sample task, in order to illustrate the lack of materiality of the change to the direct and indirect rates in effect for the October and November 2009 time period, offerors should provide the net price difference between the submitted price and the price that would have resulted had rates in effect for October and November 2009 been used to price the sample task.

**Question L-95:** Reference L.32. para (8)a. The RFP states “it is acceptable for each major or critical subcontractor or any other subcontractor with proposed work greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance to provide their separate set of Schedule 1,2, and 3 cost work sheets in sealed envelopes directly to the CO.” Is it acceptable for these referenced subcontractors to provide their indirect breakdown in a sealed envelop and provide the direct and indirect wrap rate on sheets 1, 2, and 3.

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-6, Cost Templates and Instructions, worksheet Table of Contents, Instructions for Required Cost Templates. Cost templates (included in the Attachment L-6 workbook) must be completed for offerors. Additionally, a separate set of templates (included in the Attachment L-6 workbook) must be submitted for each major or critical subcontractor or if a joint venture or newly formed entity, each member, or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance. Accordingly, it is **not** acceptable for each major or critical subcontractor or if a joint venture or newly formed entity, each member, or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance, to merely provide their indirect breakdown in a sealed envelope and provide the direct and indirect wrap rate on sheets 1, 2, and 3. Direct and indirect cost elements proposed by these entities must be broken out separately in the

submitted cost templates as required by the instructions in the applicable worksheets for Section L, Attachment L-6.

**Question L-96:** The instructions for Attachment L-6 Schedule 5. Is it acceptable to include only direct labor categories, direct labor hours, and total cost for each major/critical subcontractor by WBS by Fiscal Year on the offeror's Schedule 5, provided each major/critical subcontractor provides separate sealed envelope describing the indirect rates in sealed envelopes with the proposal?

**Answer:** Reference Attachment L-6, Schedule 5. It is acceptable to include only direct labor categories, direct labor hours, and total cost for each major or critical subcontractor or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance by WBS by Fiscal Year on the offerors' Schedule 5 provided each major or critical subcontractor or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance provides separate Schedule 5 detailed cost element information in sealed envelopes with the proposal.

**Question L-97:** Please specify if a supplier of materials or commodities would not be a major subcontractor even if the total quantity is greater than \$500,000 for the life of the project.

**Answer:** Reference Section L.29(a) and L.32. The question is not clear. Major or critical subcontractor has been defined in L.29(a), third paragraph. It is assumed that the question is referring to "any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance" as stated in Attachment L-6, Table of Contents Worksheet, Instructions for Required Cost Templates and Section L.32. A supplier of commodities would not be "any other subcontractor" even if the total dollar value is equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the life of the project. Such costs should be included under the cost element "Materials". A supplier of materials only would also not be considered "any other subcontractor"; however, if the entity is providing more than materials, such as services, the entity would be considered "any other subcontractor" for which the information should be submitted if the proposed work is equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance.

**Question L-98:** Schedule 5 requires bidders to prepare a report by Fiscal year for each WBS element active within a fiscal Year. It also requires that assumptions be listed including the Unit of Measure (UOM). Would DOE consider inserting a column between "No of Units" and "Unit Costs" to capture the UOM?

**Answer:** Reference Section L.32 and Attachment L-6, Schedule 5. A column may be added by offerors for the Unit of Measure. However, as indicated in the text box instructions for "Description of Assumptions" on Attachment L-6, Schedule 5, cost estimating information, such as the description of the element, as well as the units of measure should be addressed under an overall description of the major assumptions used in the development of the proposed costs.

**Question L-99:** Would the DOE rather have escalation as a stand-alone "Cost Element" (calculated below the line prior to fee) or, uplift each unit cost for a resource by the appropriate annual escalation factor? A Stand-alone "Cost Element" will reduce the number of multiple entries in schedule 3 that occur exclusively due to escalation and do not provide any further value other than reflecting the forecast cost increase in goods and services due to price growth. Since the escalation is fixed for all cost elements, it would seem a single entry as a cost element would be more beneficial.

**Answer:** Reference Section L.32 and Attachment L-6. Escalation shall not be applied as a stand alone Cost Element.

**Question L-100:** Reference: RFP Page 82 Criterion 1 NOTE: For purposes of the sample task, the offeror need only provide summarized contents of each of the deliverables/reports identified in the sample task as well as listing and summarized contents of other documents/reports that the offeror proposes in its approach as necessary to meet the requirements identified in the sample task. Question: We respectfully ask DOE to omit the list of documents to be delivered (and a summarization of each) from the page limitation for the sample task section.

**Answer:** Reference Section L, page 82, L.31, Criterion 1. The listing and summarized contents of the deliverables/reports identified in the sample task, as well as listing and summarized contents of other documents/reports that offerors propose in their approach as necessary to meet the requirements identified in the sample task, will be included within the page limitation of the sample task for Criteria 1 and 3.

**Question L-101:** Reference: RFP page 82, L.31, (1) Criterion 1 – Technical and Management Approach, notes “that for purposes of the sample task, the Offeror need only provide summarized contents of each of the deliverable/reports identified in the sample task as well as a listing and summarized contents of each of other documents/reports that the Offeror proposes ....” The sample task deliverables list, Table 5.0 Page 14 of 34, Section L Attachment L-4, provides about 33 such items, C.10.4 Regulatory Services provides potentially 34 other such items. A conservative estimate is that this Section L requirement could result in 6 to 10 pages of listed documents/reports, exclusive of the draft to final process. Question: Would DOE consider modifying this requirement such that the documents/deliverables only needed to appear in the resource-loaded schedule, and therefore not be part of the page count? If the listing and summary requirement remains, would DOE consider excluding it from the page count and having it as an attachment to the sample task section?

**Answer:** Please see response to Question L-100.

**Question L-102:** Question: Is a topographic map available for the site and can it be posted to the reference documents section of the web site?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-14, Representative Sample Task. A rough topographic map of the site will be posted.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-103:** Reference: RFP DE-SOL-0000638, Section L Attachment L-4, Page 29 of 34, Environmental Management Nationwide Multiple Award IDIQ – Unrestricted. Attachment L-4, In Table 2 of the sample problem, it indicates that in a northeast direction from the FSMHF it is 1,000 meters to the Site Boundary but only 900 meters to the Nearest Resident. Question: Can we inquire if the Distance from FSMHF to Site Boundary and Nearest Resident is correct?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-14, Representative Sample Task, page 29, Table 2. The number indicating the distance in meters to the site boundary and to the nearest resident, going towards the northeast, were transposed. The correct values should be 900 meters to the site boundary and 1000 meters to the closest resident in the northeastern direction.

The solicitation will be amended.



**Question L-104:** Reference: Table 2, Distance from FSMHF to Site Boundary and Nearest Resident, in DE-SOL-0000638, Section L Attachment L-4, Page 29 of 34, Environmental Management Nationwide Multiple Award IDIQ – Unrestricted. Section L Attachment L-4, Page 5 of 34 states; “The MRB as a whole is known to have asbestos floor tile including asbestos mastic in laboratories, offices, corridors, and similar areas on the ground floor outside of the FSMHF area. The Offeror should assume that 300,000 square feet of radiologically contaminated asbestos tile and mastic needs to be removed from the MRB. There is also incidental asbestos associated with the F-Wing cooling tower. No other ACM containing material is present in the MRB.”

However, Section L Attachment L-4, Page 4 of 34 states:

A-Wing 1st floor contains uncontaminated offices and a large uncontaminated conference room (A- 157). A-Wing 2nd floor contains uncontaminated offices.

B-Wing 1st floor contains a building maintenance shop, offices, a lunchroom, and a locker room (all uncontaminated). B-Wing 2nd floor contains large locker rooms and a conference room (all uncontaminated).

C-Wing 1st floor contains uncontaminated offices, contaminated labs, uncontaminated training classrooms, and uncontaminated service areas. C-Wing 2nd floor contains uncontaminated offices, potentially contaminated labs with numerous fume hoods, and contaminated labs including a uncontaminated uranium machine shop and several contaminated small hot melt laboratories.

D-Wing 1st floor contains a glovebox facility along with other potentially contaminated labs, as well as uncontaminated offices, storage, and service areas.

D-Wing 2nd floor contains offices and computer labs (all uncontaminated).

E-Wing 1st floor contains uncontaminated service and storage areas as well as a potentially contaminated cave and vault area. E-Wing 2nd floor contains offices and labs (all uncontaminated).

G-Wing 1st and 2nd floors contain offices and labs (all uncontaminated).

H-Wing 1st contains a contaminated facility previously used for milling, melting and casting of radioactive materials, primarily uranium, and a contaminated radiological machine shop for machining of radioactive materials, primarily uranium. H-Wing 2nd floor contains uncontaminated office spaces

Question: Is the recommendation to treat all asbestos tile as contaminated as a conservative assumption?

**Answer:** Please see response to Question L-8.

**Question L-105:** Referencing the Case Study, it is stated that, (page 2 of 34) “In February of 2008, the site was placed on the CERCLA National Priorities List” and (page 3 of 34) “The DOE expects that an Environmental Impact Statement will be required for the ground water remedies as well as for the demolition of the MFB and FSMHF, since no previous site specific EIS was prepared”. Is the site referring to the entire RAFTL or the MRB and associated remedies?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 3.0. The reference to the “site” refers only to the MRB and associated remedies. No other facilities or locations at RAFTL have been identified as Operable Units.

**Question L-106:** CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1506.5(c), which have been adopted by DOE (10 CFR 1021), require contractors who will prepare an EIS to execute a disclosure specifying that they have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project. The term “financial interest or other interest in the outcome of the project,” for the purposes of this disclosure, is defined in the March 23, 1981 guidance “Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations,” 46 FR 18026-18038 at Question 17a and b. Given that the remediation/DD&R contractor may be viewed by the public as having a “financial interest” in the selected remedial alternatives, can bidders assume that DOE will provide access to the National NEPA contracts as a Government-Furnished Service?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet. DOE will not provide access to the National NEPA contracts for the purposes of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) preparation. Offerors should assume that the preparer of the EIS has no financial interest or other interest in the outcome of the project.

**Question L-107:** The Sample Task Description (Section L, Attachment L-4), Section 4.3, p. 8, first full paragraph, describes storage tube assemblies in Area 2 of the FSMHF Hot Cell. The 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence states that the storage tube openings are about 2.5 in. above the floor level. The 4<sup>th</sup> sentence states that a removable steel floor plate is placed *over the trench* (italics added) and around the storage tubes. The two sentences appear to be contradictory and impede understanding of the storage tube top section vertical arrangement relative to the Hot Cell floor elevation. A cross section view of the storage tubes that shows this arrangement could not be found in the drawings provided. **Question:** Can the vertical section view of the storage tubes be clarified?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.3, 11<sup>th</sup> paragraph. A vertical section view of a storage tube will be provided for clarification on an As Built Drawing.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-108:** The Sample Task Description (Section L, Attachment L-4), Section 4.3 describes the FSMHF Hot Cell. It describes the hot cell remote handling systems and identifies the Hot Cell itself as a containment system. The list of assumptions does not include the physical condition and operability of these hot cell systems or the safety support systems. It is recognized that approval of use of these systems for initial Hot Cell investigation and source reduction purposes must be approved through BIO update and approval. **Question:** What is the physical condition and operability status of these systems?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.3, last paragraph. Offerors should assume that the Hotcell itself, the Hotcell remote handling systems, and the Safety Support Systems in addition to the Hotcell including the High-Gamma alarm system, ventilation and exhaust systems, and fire detection and alarm system, have been maintained and are fully operational.

**Question L-109:** **Question:** Regarding physical condition and operability of the Roof Enclosure and Safety Support Systems described in Section 4.3, page 9 Paragraph 2 and 3.

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.3, last two paragraphs. Initially, there does not appear to be a question; however, please see answer to Question L-119 regarding the physical condition and operability of the Safety Support Systems. Offeror should assume that the facility roof enclosure also has been maintained and is fully operational.



**Question L-110:** Question: Other than potentially impacted subsurface areas immediately adjacent to the MRB, do any of the subsurface impacted areas contain surface structures or underground utilities.

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task. Offerors should assume that the subsurface impacted areas contain no surface structure or underground utilities other than what is described or shown in the sample task narrative or figures, or as indicated in drawings.

**Question L-111:** Section L, Attachment L-4, Figure 2, 19/34. Is off-facility property accessible to investigation via existing access agreements, or do we need to pursue access on behalf of the DOE? Is off facility property physically accessible or will drilling require road development or off-road equipment?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Figure 2 and Figure 1. Offerors should assume that there are no existing access agreements for off-site property. Offerors should assume that offsite property shown as residential areas (Figure 1) is physically accessible and will not require road development or off-road equipment. Offerors should also assume, for areas not indicated as residential areas (Figure 1), that existing roads are only those shown on Figure 1 and that drilling may require development of haul roads or off-road equipment.

**Question L-112:** Section L Attachment L-4, Page 3 of 34: "Investigations identified groundwater contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOCs), primarily carbon tetrachloride, TCE and PCE, at depths ranging from 30 to 40 feet bgs in the glacial drift (Table 5). Groundwater contamination above drinking water standards also has been found in the dolomite aquifer both onsite and offsite (Table 5)."

And "Sampling of the new well revealed strontium-90 (Sr-90) contamination in the shallower portion of the glacial drift (about 20 feet bgs) at levels several times drinking water standards (drinking water standards are 8 pCi/l)." Question: Were there other analytes in addition to those reported on table 5 but not detected at reporting limits? If so, what are those analytes and what were the reporting limits?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Section 4.1 and Table 5. Offerors should assume that sample analysis was limited to only the analytes reported on Table 5.

**Question L-113:** Can you provide more legible copies of Section L Attachment L-4 Representative Sample Task Figures 7: MRB First Floor; Figure 8: MRB, Second Floor; Figure 10: Detailed Layout of the FSMHF First Floor and Figure 11: Detailed Layout of the FSMHF Second Floor?

**Answer:** Reference Section L, Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, Figure 7 (MRB First Floor); Figure 8 (MRB Second Floor); Figure 10 (Detailed Layout of the FSMHF First Floor) and Figure 11 (Detailed Layout of the FSMHF Second Floor). More legible copies of the referenced Figures are not available.

**Question L-114:** Can you provide detailed construction drawings similar to what you provided for the MRB Wing F for MRB Wings A, B, C, D, E, G, and H?

**Answer:** Reference Attachment L-4, Representative Sample Task, As Built Drawings. Detailed construction drawings similar to those provided for MRB Wing F are not available for Wings A, B, C, D, E, G and H. Some additional As Built drawings will be provided for these wings that show HVAC information and floor layouts.

The solicitation will be amended.

**Question L-115:** The Sample task Description (Section L, Attachment L-4), Figures 5, 6 and 12 show a structure attached to the south side of the MRB Wing F. It has a footprint of approximately 3600 ft<sup>2</sup>, based on the scale drawing in Figure 6. This structure is not shown in the detailed facility drawings. This structure is located above one of the areas on the MRB periphery where soil samples indicate the presence of subsurface contamination (radiological and hazardous materials). Question: Shall it be assumed that this structure is not present in the sample problem and is not to be included in the work scope?

**Answer:** Please see response to Question L-72.

**Question L-116:** Reference: RFP page 81, L.30, Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume I, Item 12, Small Disadvantage Business Participation Program – “In order to receive credit under Criterion 3, the offeror must provide, with its offer, targets, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value, for SDB participation in any of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Industry Subsectors as determined by the Department of Commerce. The targets may provide for participation by a prime contractor, joint venture partner, teaming arrangement member, or subcontractor; however, the targets for subcontractors must be listed separately. Question: As the total contract amount is yet to be determined, would DOE consider expressing targets as a percentage of the total contract amount in lieu of total contract dollars.

**Answer:** Reference L.30 (b)(12). Targets should be expressed as a percentage of the total contract value which is \$907,000,000. The total contract amount/value (the maximum quantity) has been determined and it is \$907,000,000. However, it is assumed that the question refers to the total dollar amount of Task Orders that may be issued to a specific contractor. The total dollar amount of Task Orders that may be issued to a specific contractor is not relevant to the targets that are to be provided with the proposal. The targets are to be based on the total contract value.

**Question L-117:** Reference: RFP page 81, L.30, Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume I, Item 12, Small Disadvantage Business Participation Program – Target, requires to receive credit under Criterion 3 the offer must provide targets expressed in dollars of total contract and this target is also submitted [sic] the completion Attachment L8. Question: Should total contract dollars be provided for SDB Targets, will DOE be amenable to modification of the targets should the total contract dollars not be awarded.

**Answer:** Reference L.30 (b)(12). See answer to Question L-92. Compliance with the target percentages specified in the proposal will be monitored against the total Task Order dollars awarded throughout the life of the contract.

**Question L-118:** L.31 (3) Criterion 3, page 85 of 98. The RFP requests targets expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value for SDB participation. Question: Under an ID/IQ without a defined contract value, how can targets be expressed in dollars?

**Answer:** See answer to Questions L-116 and L-117.

**Question L-119:** In accordance with section L.30 EMCBC-L-1003, (b) (12) (b) , "In order to receive credit under Criterion 3, the offeror must provide, with its offer, targets, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value, for SDB participation in any of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Industry Subsectors .....” Please clarify what contract value the offeror should assume for the purpose of calculating the SDB participation targets. Should we assume the total contract value is \$907 million, or use the Sample Task cost estimate?

**Answer:** See answer to Questions L-116 and L-117.

**Question L-120:** Reference: RFP page 84, Criterion 2 (NOTE: Work performed within an approximate range of \$75M to \$300M and durations of 3 to 5 years and/or work being performed or that has been performed under two or more contracts/projects concurrently may be considered to be similar). Question: Would the government consider removing the project value threshold for SB subcontractors (allowing projects <\$75M) so the work presented on their behalf is reflective of their intended scope under this contract? Can a Small Business Teaming Partner bring projects that are less than \$75M?

**Answer:** Reference Section L.31 (2) Criterion 2 – Relevant Experiences and Attachment L-3. The instructions contained in Section L.31(2) Criterion 2 for completion of Attachment L-3 Experience & Past Performance Reference Information Form, which is used for the evaluation of Criterion 2, Relevant Experience and Criterion 4, Relevant Past Performance, states in part, as follows:

“ .... The offeror, any major or critical subcontracts and if a joint or newly formed entity, each member, shall identify its role in the performance of the contract.” ... “The experience information provided ... for each of the referenced contracts shall identify the portion of the work (size, scope, and complexity) that was performed by the offeror under each referenced contract. ... The offeror shall also describe the depth and breadth of the role of offeror, its major or critical subcontractors, and if a joint venture or a newly formed entity, each member's role, in the management and execution of the experience cited. In addition to the information described above, the offeror shall also clearly identify and define the work to be performed (size, scope, and complexity) by each entity (offeror, major or critical subcontractors, and/or member of joint ventures or LLC) under the Offeror's proposed approach to complete the work identified in the PWS for this solicitation.”

Section M.7(2) Criterion 2 states, in part, that “DOE will evaluate the experience of the offeror and any major or critical subcontractors, or in the case of a newly formed entity, each member, with respect to the type of work that each entity is proposed to perform and commensurate with the portion of the overall work being performed by each entity.”

A similar comparison regarding the role of the major or critical subcontractor will be conducted under Criterion 4, Relevant Past Performance. The evaluation of relevancy which includes size, scope, and complexity, will be evaluated in context of the work or role that the entity is proposed to perform under the contract.

**Question L-121:** Reference: RFP page 84, Criterion 2 – Relevant Experience, allows no more than three contracts for the Offeror and no more than three contracts for each of the team members. The Offeror's contracts, or projects, must be within the approximate range of \$75M to \$300M, but there is no range established for team members or any critical and major subcontractor. Question: Would DOE consider setting the project dollar range for these other team or subcontract members to be in the range of the amount of the work to be performed by these team members or subcontractors? For example, if a team member is slated to execute \$5M over five years the range of applicable project dollar size would be from \$0.4M to \$1.6M, using the same ratios as those specified by DOE for the Offeror.

**Answer:** See Answer to Question L-120. It is not clear what is meant by the ratios specified by DOE. DOE did not specify ratios and offerors should not interpret the ranges as ratios. In order to clarify the interpretation presented by the example in the Question, a major or critical subcontractor proposed to perform \$5M over five years with relevant experience projects provided that are valued at \$0.4M to \$1.6M over five years may not be considered similar in terms of size commensurate with the portion of the overall work being performed by the major or critical subcontractor.

DE-SOL-0000638  
Questions & Answers L-81 through L-123  
Posted 11/19/2009

**Question L-122:** Please confirm the following DOE SB agency goals are correct: SB-46.4%, SDB-5%, WO-5%, HUBZone-3%, VO-3%, SDVO-3%.

**Answer:** Reference L.30 (b)(11). The DOE Small Business Subcontracting Goals stated in Policy Flash 2008-19 posted to the Nationwide IDIQ webpage are as follows: 46.4% for Small Business Concerns, 5% for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns, 5% for Women-Owned Small Business Concerns, 3% for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, and 3% for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns is 3%. Small Business Subcontracting goals have not been updated for Fiscal Year 2010 and offerors should use the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 goals.

**Question L-123:** Reference: Section L.29(a) "The term "major or critical subcontractor" as used in this solicitation is defined as subcontractors proposed to perform the following services with a dollar value of \$5M or more... and regardless of dollar value, any subcontractor proposed to perform activities associated with the DD&R of a Hazard Category 3, 2, 1 facility(ies) or portion of the facility(ies)."  
Reference: Section L.32 requires additional data including Schedules 1-3 from "each major or critical subcontractor or any other subcontractor with proposed work equal to or greater than \$500,000 over the period of performance." Question: If a "major or critical subcontractor" identified according to L.29(a) does not meet the \$500K threshold for work performed in the Sample Task, is additional documentation still required in Volume III (e.g., Schedules 1-3, Indirect Rates, Financial Statements, etc.)?

**Answer:** Reference Section L.29 (a), L.32, and Attachment L-6. The documentation in Section L.32 (8), (10), (11), (12) and (13) is required for all major or critical subcontractors as defined in Section L.29(a). Therefore, in accordance with Section L.29(a), **regardless of dollar value** any subcontractor proposed to perform activities associated with the DD&R of a Hazard Category 3, 2, 1 facility(ies) or portion of the facility(ies) is a major or critical subcontractor. Therefore, the information in Section L.32 (8), (10), (11), (12) and (13) should be provided for these major or critical subcontractors. The monetary amount of \$500,000 specified in Section L.32 (8) a., 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, and Attachment L-6, is applicable to "any other subcontractors" proposed by the offeror that are not major or critical subcontractors as defined in Section L.29(a).